arXiv:1401.7060v1 [math.AP] 28 Jan 2014

LOCAL EXISTENCE THEORY FOR DERIVATIVE NONLINEAR SCHRÖDINGER EQUATIONS WITH NON-INTEGER POWER NONLINEARITIES

DAVID M. AMBROSE AND GIDEON SIMPSON

Abstract. We study a derivative nonlinear Schrödinger equation, allowing non-integer powers in the nonlinearity, $|u|^{2\sigma} u_x$. Making careful use of the energy method, we are able to establish short-time existence of solutions with initial data in the energy space, H^1. For more regular initial data, we establish not just existence of solutions, but also well-posedness of the initial value problem. These results hold for real-valued $\sigma \geq 1$, while prior existence results in the literature require integer-valued σ or σ sufficiently large ($\sigma \geq 5/2$), or use higher-regularity function spaces.

1. Introduction

We consider the following generalization of the derivative nonlinear Schrödinger equation (DNLS),

$$iu_t + i\,|u|^{2\sigma} u_x + u_{xx} = 0, \quad u : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C} \tag{1.1}$$

with $\sigma \geq 1$, a real number. This equation, gDNLS, was recently studied in [16, 17] for both the properties of its solitons and its potential for singularity formation.

The original derivative nonlinear Schrödinger equation, was written as

$$iv_t + i(|v|^2 v)_x + v_{xx} = 0, \tag{1.2}$$

and appeared as a long-wavelength approximation for Alfvén waves in plasma physics [20]. Under a non-degenerate gauge transformation, (1.2) becomes (1.1) with $\sigma = 1$, the cubic case. With $\sigma = 1$, (1.1) has also appeared as a model for self-steepening optical pulses [18].

The cubic version of (1.1) (*i.e.*, the case $\sigma = 1$) has received significant attention, with early well-posedness results due to Tsutsumi and Fukuda, followed by work by Hayashi and Ozawa, in H^1 and higher regularity spaces [9–12, 19, 21]. More recently Colliander *et al.* and Grünrock and Herr have treated the problem in H^s spaces with $s < 1$ [2, 3, 7, 13].

Generalizing to $\sigma > 1$, the analysis is incomplete. In [8], local well-posedness was proven for (1.1) in $H^{1/2}$, but only for $\sigma \geq 5/2$. The theorems of [14, 15] could be directly applied to problems with $\sigma \in \mathbb{N}$, but these would also give results in higher-regularity spaces. While the paper [21] only treats the cubic problem, it is mentioned there that non-integer powers in the nonlinearity may be treated by the same method. This is left vague, however, as it is stated that the nonlinearity must be "smooth." In any case, the result of [21] for the cubic equation is in the space

Date: January 29, 2014.

DMA gratefully acknowledges support from the National Science Foundation through grants DMS-1008387 and DMS-1016267.

$H^{1.5+}$ which is more regular than the energy space. Therefore, none of these works treat the same parameter regime as in the present study, since we allow real-valued $\sigma \geq 1$ and we demonstrate existence in H^1, the energy space.

In two recent works, [16, 17], (1.1) was considered with $1 < \sigma < 2$. Simulations presented in these works used smooth data, on a periodic domain. To be well justified, it is thus desirable to have a high regularity well-posedness result, with solutions in, say, H^2. Additionally, in [17], the stability of the soliton solutions of gDNLS was examined in H^1. The results are conditional on the existence of weak solutions, $u \in C(0,T;H^1(\mathbb{R}))$, such that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\langle u(t), \phi\rangle = \left\langle \frac{\delta \mathcal{H}}{\delta \bar{u}}, i\phi \right\rangle, \quad \phi \in H^{-1} \tag{1.3}$$

where $\mathcal{H}$ is the Hamiltonian defined below in (1.4). This formulation is motivated by the framework of Grillakis, Shatah, and Strauss, [5, 6], whose methods were applied in [17]. Thus, it is of interest to develop an H^1 and higher regularity theory for (1.1) with more flexibility on σ. For a general initial condition $u_0 \in H^1$, we do not establish the existence of a solution $u \in C(0,T;H^1)$, but instead we find $u \in L^\infty(0,T;H^1) \cap C(0,T;H^s)$, for any $s < 1$. However, by studying more regular initial data, $u_0 \in H^2$, we find solutions in $u \in C(0,T;H^2)$. These solutions are also in $C(0,T;H^s)$ for all $s < 2$, and thus are in $C(0,T;H^1)$.

The motivation for obtaining results in H^1 is because this is the energy space of the problem. Indeed, (1.1) formally conserves

$$\mathcal{H} = \int |u_x|^2 + \frac{1}{(\sigma+1)^2}\bar{u}^{\sigma+1} D_x u^{\sigma+1}\, dx, \quad D_x \equiv \frac{1}{i}\partial_x, \tag{1.4}$$

which is well-defined for H^1 functions. Though we will not make use of it, (1.1) can then be written as

$$u_t = -i\frac{\delta \mathcal{H}}{\delta \bar{u}}.$$

The equation also conserves mass

$$\mathcal{M} = \int |u|^2\, dx, \tag{1.5}$$

and momentum

$$\mathcal{P} = \int -\frac{1}{2}\bar{u} D_x u. \tag{1.6}$$

Studying the problem on $\mathbb{T} = [0, 2\pi)$, we seek mild solutions $u \in L^\infty(0,T;H^1)$ such that

$$u = e^{i\partial_x^2 t}u_0 - \int_0^t e^{i\partial_x^2(t-s)}|u|^{2\sigma}u_x\, ds. \tag{1.7}$$

Our first main result is:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\sigma \geq 1$ be given. Let $u_0 \in H^1$. There exists $T > 0$ and $u \in L^\infty(0,T;H^1)$ such that u is a mild solution of (1.1), i.e., u satisfies (1.7). Furthermore, for all s such that $0 \leq s < 1$, $u \in C(0,T;H^s)$.*

In addition to proving the existence of solutions for the initial value problem in H^1 as described in Theorem 1.1, we also are able to demonstrate some properties of solutions. In particular, we will discuss the conservation of the invariants for these solutions, and the regularity with regard to time.

Our existence proof follows the energy method. We first introduce a mollified evolution equation, for which we can apply the Picard theorem to get existence of solutions. We prove an energy estimate for the solutions of the mollified problem, which demonstrates that the solutions cannot blow up until a certain time, with this time being independent of the mollification parameter. We conclude that the solutions of the mollified problem exist on a common time interval, and this enables us to take the limit of the solutions as the mollification parameter vanishes. Finally, we demonstrate that the limit solves the non-mollified evolution equation (1.1). The energy method is, generally speaking, easier to apply at higher regularity. In the present setting, in which the data is only in H^1, this final step is fairly delicate, and requires significant effort.

If we allow for higher regularity, taking the initial data from H^2 instead, we can make additional estimates, and we can then prove more. This is the content of our second theorem:

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\sigma \geq 1$ be given. Let $u_0 \in H^2$. There exists $T > 0$ and a unique $u \in C(0, T; H^2)$ satisfying (1.7). Furthermore, the solution depends continuously upon the initial conditions in the H^s norm for all $0 \leq s < 2$.*

In Section 2 below, we will state some elementary results that will be useful throughout the rest of the text. In Section 3, we establish short-time existence of solutions when the initial data is in H^1, and we study the conserved quantities for these solutions. We then establish our H^2 result in Section 4. We conclude with some remarks and conjectures in Section 5.

2. Preliminary Results

Our results are based on the energy method, which requires us first to mollify (1.1), then to prove existence of solutions for the mollified problem, and finally to let the mollification parameter vanish. In this section, we introduce the mollifiers and establish some preliminary properties needed for our main results. For $\varepsilon > 0$ we introduce a mollifier $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$. We choose this so that it is a projection, *i.e.*, $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon = \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon^2$; since we are studying the spatially periodic case, it makes sense to let this be the projection onto modes with wavenumber at most $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$. We let $\mathcal{F}$ represent the (periodic) Fourier transform, so that

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon g - g)(k) = \begin{cases} 0 & |k| \leq \lceil \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \rceil, \\ -\mathcal{F}(g)(k) & |k| > \lceil \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \rceil. \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

We use the following mollifier inequality, which holds for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and any $f \in L^2$.

$$\|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon f\|_{L^2} \leq \|f\|_{L^2}. \tag{2.2}$$

Another inequality we will use is, for $s \geq 0$,

$$\|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon f\|_{H^s} \leq \frac{c}{\varepsilon^s} \|f\|_{L^2}. \tag{2.3}$$

Also, we can take the following limit, for $g \in H^m$ with $m \geq 0$:

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0^+} \|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon g - g\|_{H^m} = 0. \tag{2.4}$$

These properties of the mollifier follow directly from Plancherel's Theorem.

The next result concerns the interplay of this spatial mollifier with a space-time norm:

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\tau > 0$ and $m \geq 0$ be given, and let g be an element of $L^2(0,\tau;H^m)$. Then $\mathcal{J}_\eta g$ converges to g in this space, as $\eta \to 0^+$.*

Proof. We consider the norm of $\mathcal{J}_\eta g - g$:

$$\|\mathcal{J}_\eta g - g\|^2_{L^2(0,\tau;H^m)} = \int_0^\tau \|\mathcal{J}_\eta g - g\|^2_{H^m}\, ds = \int_0^\tau \int_0^{2\pi} |\Lambda^m(\mathcal{J}_\eta g - g)|^2 + |\mathcal{J}_\eta g - g|^2\, dxds,$$

where Λ is the operator with symbol $\mathcal{F}\Lambda(k) = |k|$. We use Plancherel's Theorem:

$$\|\mathcal{J}_\eta g - g\|^2_{L^2(0,\tau;H^m)} = \int_0^\tau \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} (1+|k|^{2m})|\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{J}_\eta g - g)(k)|^2\, ds.$$

The definition of $\mathcal{J}_\eta$ implies that for $|k| < N$, where $N \sim \frac{1}{\eta}$, these Fourier coefficients are equal to zero. Also, for $|k| \geq N$, we have $\mathcal{J}_\eta g(k) = 0$. We can thus rewrite the sum:

$$\|\mathcal{J}_\eta g - g\|^2_{L^2(0,\tau;H^m)} = \int_0^\tau \sum_{|k|\geq N} (1+|k|^{2m})|\mathcal{F}(g)(k)|^2\, ds.$$

By Tonelli's Theorem, we can exchange the order of the integral and the sum:

$$\|\mathcal{J}_\eta g - g\|^2_{L^2(0,\tau;H^m)} = \sum_{|k|\geq N} \int_0^\tau (1+|k|^{2m})|\mathcal{F}(g)(k)|^2\, ds. \tag{2.5}$$

Since $g \in L^2(0,\tau;H^m)$, we know that

$$\int_0^\tau \|g\|^2_{H^m}\, ds = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_0^\tau (1+|k|^{2m})|\mathcal{F}(g)(k)|^2\, ds$$

is finite. The right-hand side of (2.5) is therefore the sum of the tails of a convergent series; as such, it goes to zero as $N \to \infty$, which is the same as saying as η vanishes. This completes the proof of the lemma. □

We will also make use of the elementary Sobolev interpolation lemma:

Lemma 2.2. *Let $m \geq 0$ and $\ell \geq m$ be given. Let $f \in H^\ell$ be given. Then, the following inequality holds:*

$$\|f\|_{H^m} \leq c\|f\|^{m/\ell}_{H^\ell}\|f\|^{1-m/\ell}_{L^2}. \tag{2.6}$$

The proof of this lemma can be found in [1], among other places.

3. Existence theory in H^1

Our mollified evolution equation is:

$$u_{\varepsilon,t} = -\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon\left(|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon|^{2\sigma}\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x}\right) + i\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,xx}. \tag{3.1}$$

There is a slight abuse of notation in the last term of the above expression in that we imagine $u_\varepsilon \in H^1$, so its second derivative may not be well defined. However, we treat

$$\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,xx} = \partial_x^2\left(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon\right),$$

which resolves any ambiguity. Our data is unmollified, and denoted

$$u_\varepsilon(x,0) = u_0(x) \in H^1(\mathbb{T}).$$

We consider the case $\sigma \geq 1$ and seek existence of solutions in the space H^1.

We introduce the notation

$$u_{\varepsilon,t} = \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon F_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon),$$

so that

$$F_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) = -|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon|^{2\sigma}\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x} + i\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,xx}.$$

Notice that we have used here the property that $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon = \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon^2$.

Step 1: Existence for a very short time.

To show that (3.1) has a local in time solution, we must prove that $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon F_\varepsilon$ is locally Lipschitz continuous on H^1. To begin, we use (2.3) as follows:

$$\|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon F_\varepsilon(f) - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon F_\varepsilon(g)\|_{H^1} \leq \frac{c}{\varepsilon}\|F_\varepsilon(f) - F_\varepsilon(g)\|_{L^2}.$$

After adding and subtracting, we apply the triangle inequality to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}(3.2)\quad \|F_\varepsilon(f) - F_\varepsilon(g)\|_{L^2} &\leq \||\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon f|^{2\sigma}(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(f_x - g_x))\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + \|(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon g_x)(|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon f|^{2\sigma} - |\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon g|^{2\sigma})\|_{L^2} + \|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(f_{xx} - g_{xx})\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

The first and third terms on the right-hand side can clearly be bounded by $\|f - g\|_{H^1}$; for the third term this again makes use of (2.3). For the second term on the right-hand side, it can also be bounded by $\|f - g\|_{H^1}$ (in fact it can be bounded by $\|f - g\|_{L^2}$) using the fact that $|z|^{2\sigma}$ is a Lipschitz continuous function. By the Picard Theorem for ODEs on a Banach space, this implies that there exists $T_\varepsilon > 0$ and $u_\varepsilon \in C^1((-T_\varepsilon, T_\varepsilon); H^1)$ which is a solution of the initial value problem.

Step 2: A uniform time interval.

Next, we would like to establish that the solutions are uniformly bounded with respect to ε; this will allow us to extend the interval of existence to be independent of ε.

We will shortly introduce our energy functional. The H^1 norm of the solution, u_ε, will be controlled by the energy. Before introducing it, we make a few estimates.

Lemma 3.1. *For any real number $r \geq 1$, there exist constants $c > 0$ and $p \geq 1$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\int_0^{2\pi} |u_\varepsilon|^{2r}\, dx &\leq c(1 + \|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^1}^2)^p, \\ \frac{d}{dt}\int_0^{2\pi} |\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon|^{2r}\, dx &\leq c(1 + \|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^1}^2)^p.\end{aligned}$$

We emphasize that in the above inequalities, c and p are independent of ε.

Proof. This follows from direct calculation. For the first expression,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\int |u_\varepsilon|^{2r} &= \int \bar{u_\varepsilon}^r u_\varepsilon^{r-1} u_{\varepsilon,t} + \text{c.c.} \\ &= \int -\bar{u_\varepsilon}^r u_\varepsilon^{r-1} |\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon|^{2\sigma} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x} + i\bar{u_\varepsilon}^r u_\varepsilon^{r-1}\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,xx} + \text{c.c.}.\end{aligned}$$

We integrate by parts in the second integral on the right-hand side, and we apply a derivative:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\int |u_\varepsilon|^{2r} &= \int -\bar{u_\varepsilon}^r u_\varepsilon^{r-1} \left|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon\right|^{2\sigma} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x} - i\left(\bar{u_\varepsilon}^r u_\varepsilon^{r-1}\right)_x \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x} + \text{c.c.}\\ &= \int -\bar{u_\varepsilon}^r u_\varepsilon^{r-1} \left|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon\right|^{2\sigma} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x} - ir\left|u_\varepsilon\right|^{2r-2} \bar{u}_{\varepsilon,x}\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x}\\ &\qquad - i(r-1)\bar{u_\varepsilon}^r u_\varepsilon^{r-2} u_{\varepsilon,x}\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x} + \text{c.c.}.\end{aligned}$$

We are then able to bound all of these terms:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\int |u_\varepsilon|^{2r} &\leq 2\left\|u_\varepsilon\right\|_{L^\infty}^{2r-2}\left\|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon\right\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma}\left\|u_\varepsilon\right\|_{L^2}\left\|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x}\right\|_{L^2}\\ &\qquad + 2r\left\|u_\varepsilon\right\|_{L^\infty}^{2r-2}\left\|u_{\varepsilon,x}\right\|_{L^2}\left\|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x}\right\|_{L^2}\\ &\qquad + 2(r-1)\left\|u_\varepsilon\right\|_{L^\infty}^{2r-2}\left\|u_{\varepsilon,x}\right\|_{L^2}\left\|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x}\right\|_{L^2}\\ &\leq \left\|u_\varepsilon\right\|_{H^1}^{2r+2\sigma} + (4r-2)\left\|u_\varepsilon\right\|_{H^1}^{2r}\\ &\leq (4r-1)\left(1+\left\|u_\varepsilon\right\|_{H^1}^2\right)^{r+\sigma}.\end{aligned}$$

The calculation for the second inequality is similar. □

We introduce an approximate version of the Hamiltonian, (1.4):

$$\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon[f] = \int_0^{2\pi} |f_x|^2 + \frac{1}{(\sigma+1)^2}(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \bar{f})^{\sigma+1} D_x (\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon f)^{\sigma+1}\, dx. \tag{3.3}$$

This is conserved for solutions of the mollified evolution; this is the content of the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *The evolution conserves $\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon[u_\varepsilon]$. That is,*

$$\frac{d\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon[u_\varepsilon]}{dt} = 0.$$

Proof. We take the time derivative of $\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon[u_\varepsilon]$:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon[u_\varepsilon]}{dt} = \int_0^{2\pi} u_{\varepsilon,xt}\bar{u}_{\varepsilon,x} + u_{\varepsilon,x}\bar{u}_{\varepsilon,xt} - \frac{1}{\sigma+1}(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \bar{u}_\varepsilon)^\sigma (\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \bar{u}_{\varepsilon,t}) i\partial_x (\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon)^{\sigma+1}\\ - \frac{1}{\sigma+1}(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \bar{u}_\varepsilon)^{\sigma+1} i\partial_x\left[(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon)^\sigma (\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,t})\right]\, dx.\end{aligned}$$

We integrate by parts and so on, yielding the following:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon[u_\varepsilon]}{dt} = \int_0^{2\pi} -u_{\varepsilon,t}\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon\bar{u}_{\varepsilon,xx} - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,xx}\bar{u}_{\varepsilon,t} - (\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon\bar{u}_\varepsilon)^\sigma(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon\bar{u}_{\varepsilon,t}) i(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon)^\sigma(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x})\\ + (\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon\bar{u}_\varepsilon)^\sigma(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon\bar{u}_{\varepsilon,x}) i(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon)^\sigma(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,t})\, dx.\end{aligned}$$

In the above expression, we have used that $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,t} = u_{\varepsilon,t}$, allowing us to integrate by parts and still have a quantity in L^2. Using this property, and that $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon^2 = \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$, the expression becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon[u_\varepsilon]}{dt} = \int_0^{2\pi} &- u_{\varepsilon,t}\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon\bar{u}_{\varepsilon,xx} - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,xx}\bar{u}_{\varepsilon,t}\\ &- i|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon|^{2\sigma}(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x})\bar{u}_{\varepsilon,t} + i|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon|^{2\sigma}(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon\bar{u}_{\varepsilon,x})u_{\varepsilon,t}\, dx.\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

Next, we plug in from the evolution equation (3.1). We write the result as

$$\frac{d\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon[u_\varepsilon]}{dt} = A_1 + A_2 + A_3 + A_4,$$

where each of these corresponds to one of the terms in the integrand in (3.4). We spell out each of these:

$$\begin{aligned}
A_1 &= \int_0^{2\pi} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \bar{u}_{\varepsilon,xx} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \left(|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon|^{2\sigma} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x} \right) \, dx - \int_0^{2\pi} i \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \bar{u}_{\varepsilon,xx} \left(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,xx} \right) \, dx, \\
A_2 &= \int_0^{2\pi} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,xx} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \left(|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon|^{2\sigma} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \bar{u}_{\varepsilon,x} \right) \, dx + \int_0^{2\pi} i \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,xx} \left(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \bar{u}_{\varepsilon,xx} \right) \, dx, \\
A_3 &= \int_0^{2\pi} i |\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon|^{2\sigma} (\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x}) \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \left(|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon|^{2\sigma} (\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \bar{u}_{\varepsilon,x}) \right) \, dx \\
&\quad - \int_0^{2\pi} |\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon|^{2\sigma} (\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x}) (\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \bar{u}_{\varepsilon,xx}) \, dx, \\
A_4 &= - \int_0^{2\pi} i |\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon|^{2\sigma} (\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \bar{u}_{\varepsilon,x}) \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \left(|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon|^{2\sigma} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x} \right) \, dx \\
&\quad - \int_0^{2\pi} |\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon|^{2\sigma} (\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \bar{u}_{\varepsilon,x}) (\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,xx}) \, dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Adding these, and repeatedly using the fact that $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$ is self-adjoint, we see that they all cancel. Thus,

$$\frac{d\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon[u_\varepsilon]}{dt} = 0.$$

□

We are almost in a position to define our energy functional. This requires, however, first establishing a relationship between the Hamiltonian and the H^1 norm.

Lemma 3.3. *There exists a constant $\bar{c} > 0$, independent of ε, such that*

$$\frac{1}{2} \|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^1}^2 \leq \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon[u_\varepsilon] + \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{1}{2} |u_\varepsilon|^2 + \bar{c} |\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon|^{4\sigma+2} \, dx. \tag{3.5}$$

Proof. We use the following (standard) definition of the square of the H^1 norm:

$$\|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^2}^1 = \int_0^{2\pi} |u_\varepsilon|^2 + |u_{\varepsilon,x}|^2 \, dx.$$

Using this with (3.3) and (3.5), we see that we are attempting to find $\bar{c} > 0$ such that the following inequality is true:

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \frac{1}{(\sigma+1)^2} (\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \bar{u}_\varepsilon)^{\sigma+1} i \partial_x (\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon)^{\sigma+1} \, dx \leq \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{1}{2} |u_{\varepsilon,x}|^2 + \bar{c} |\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon|^{4\sigma+2} \, dx.$$

We apply the derivative in the integrand on the left-hand side:

$$\frac{1}{(\sigma+1)^2} (\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \bar{u}_\varepsilon)^{\sigma+1} i \partial_x (\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon)^{\sigma+1} = \frac{i}{\sigma+1} (\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \bar{u}_\varepsilon)^{\sigma+1} (\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon)^\sigma \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x}.$$

We bound this with its absolute value, and we also use Young's Inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{(\sigma+1)^2}(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon\bar{u}_\varepsilon)^{\sigma+1}i\partial_x(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon)^{\sigma+1} &\leq \left|\frac{i}{\sigma+1}(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon\bar{u}_\varepsilon)^{\sigma+1}(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon)^{\sigma}\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x}\right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2(\sigma+1)^2}\left|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon\right|^{4\sigma+2} + \frac{1}{2}|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x}|^2.\end{aligned}$$

Integrating, and using the inequality (2.2), the proof is complete. Note that the constant $\bar{c}$ is given by $\bar{c} = \frac{1}{2(\sigma+1)^2}$. □

We are now able to define the energy; it is given by the right-hand side of (3.5). We define

$$\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon = \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon[u_\varepsilon] + \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{1}{2}|u_\varepsilon|^2 + \bar{c}|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon|^{4\sigma+2}\, dx. \tag{3.6}$$

Using Lemma 3.1, Lemma 3.2, and Lemma 3.3, we are able to conclude

$$\frac{d\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon}{dt} \leq c(1+\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon)^p.$$

This implies that the energy cannot blow up arbitrarily fast. Combining this with the Continuation Theorem for ODEs on a Banach space, we conclude that there exists $T > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon > 0$, the solution u_ε exists on the time interval $[0, T]$. The solutions u_ε are therefore uniformly bounded in the space $C([0,T]; H^1)$.

Step 3: Passage to the limit as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

The result of this step is the existence of $u \in L^\infty([0,T]; H^1)$, which is the limit of a subsequence of u_ε. We prove this by using the Aubin-Lions Lemma (see Lemma 8.4 of [4]). In particular, our family of approximate solutions, u_ε, is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty([0,T]; H^1)$, and it is therefore uniformly bounded in $L^2(0,T; H^1)$. Furthermore, inspection of the equation (3.1) shows that the family $u_{\varepsilon,t}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^2(0,T; H^{-1})$. Since $H^1([0,2\pi])$ is compactly embedded in $L^2([0,2\pi])$, which is in turn continuously embedded in $H^{-1}([0,2\pi])$, and since H^1, L^2, and H^{-1} are all separable, reflexive spaces, we use the Aubin-Lions Lemma to conclude that there exists a subsequence (which we do not relabel) and a limit $u \in L^2(0,T; L^2)$ such that u_ε converges to u in this space.

Since u_ε converges to u in $L^2(0,T; L^2)$, we see that for almost every t, $u_\varepsilon(\cdot, t)$ converges to $u(\cdot, t)$ in L^2 (along a further subsequence if necessary). Furthermore, for every t, we know that $u_\varepsilon(\cdot, t)$ is bounded in H^1 (uniformly with respect to both t and ε). Since the unit ball of a Hilbert space is weakly compact, there exists a subsequence which converges to a weak limit in H^1; this weak limit, however, must be equal to u. So, $u(\cdot, t)$ is, for almost every t, in H^1, with a bound independent of t. This implies $u \in L^\infty([0,T]; H^1)$. We can then use Lemma 2.2 to conclude that u_ε converges to u in the space $L^2(0,T; H^{s'})$ for any $s' \in [0,1)$.

Step 4: The limit solves the original equation.

The solutions, u_ε, of (3.1) are classical solutions, and thus are also solutions in the mild sense. Therefore, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, we can write

$$u_\varepsilon = e^{i\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon\partial_x^2 t}u_0 - \int_0^t e^{i\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon\partial_x^2(t-s)}\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon\left(|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon|^{2\sigma}\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x}\right)\, ds. \tag{3.7}$$

We need to carefully take the limit of this to show that u actually solves (1.1), in the mild sense.

First, we apply an additional mollifier. Fix $\delta > 0$ and apply $\mathcal{J}_\delta$ to (3.7). Notice that J_δ commutes with both the integral and the semigroup. This yields the following:

$$\mathcal{J}_\delta u_\varepsilon = e^{i\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \partial_x^2 t}\mathcal{J}_\delta u_0 - \int_0^t e^{i\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \partial_x^2 (t-s)}\mathcal{J}_\delta \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \left(|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon|^{2\sigma}\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x}\right)\, ds. \tag{3.8}$$

We will first take the limit of (3.8) as ε vanishes, and then as δ vanishes.

If we consider $t \in [0,T]$, we may define the following operators:

$$B_\varepsilon : L^2 \to L^2, \qquad \mathcal{B}_\varepsilon : L^2(0,t;L^2) \to L^2,$$

with

$$B_\varepsilon f \equiv e^{i\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \partial_x^2 t} f \tag{3.9}$$

$$\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon f \equiv \int_0^t B_\varepsilon(s-t) f\, ds \tag{3.10}$$

We similarly define the limiting operators B and $\mathcal{B}$, as follows:

$$B : L^2 \to L^2, \qquad \mathcal{B} : L^2(0,t;L^2) \to L^2,$$

with

$$Bf \equiv e^{i\partial_x^2 t} f, \tag{3.11}$$

$$\mathcal{B}f \equiv \int_0^t B(t-s) f\, ds. \tag{3.12}$$

These are all bounded linear operators between the given spaces, with operator norms independent of ε. We let $f_\varepsilon = \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \left(|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon|^{2\sigma}\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x}\right)$, and $f = |u|^{2\sigma}u_x$.

To obtain the result of this step, we need to prove the convergence of $B_\varepsilon \to B$ and $\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon \to \mathcal{B}$ in their strong operator topologies, and then show $\mathcal{J}_\delta f_\varepsilon \to \mathcal{J}_\delta f$ in $L^2(0,t;L^2)$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $t \in [0,T]$. $B_\varepsilon \to B$ in the strong operator topology of $L^2 \to L^2$, while $\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon \to \mathcal{B}$ in the strong operator toplogy of $L^2([0,t];L^2) \to L^2([0,t];L^2)$.*

Proof. We only prove the second, more complicated, convergence result. Let $g \in L^2(0,t;L^2)$ be given. Using the triangle inequality and Hölder's inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon - \mathcal{B})g\|_{L^2} &= \left\| \int_0^t (B_\varepsilon(t-s) - B(t-s))g\, ds \right\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq \int_0^t \|(B_\varepsilon(t-s) - B(t-s))g\|_{L^2}\, ds \\
&\leq c\left(\int_0^t \|(B_\varepsilon(t-s) - B(t-s))g\|_{L^2}^2\, ds\right)^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using Plancherel's Theorem and Tonelli's Theorem, we then have:

$$\begin{aligned}(3.13)\quad &\int_0^t \|(B_\varepsilon(t-s)-B(t-s))g\|_{L^2}^2 \; ds \\ &= \int_0^t \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \left|\mathcal{F}\left((B_\varepsilon(t-s)-B(t-s))g\right)(k)\right|^2 \; ds \\ &= \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_0^t \left|\mathcal{F}\left((B_\varepsilon(t-s)-B(t-s))g\right)(k)\right|^2 \; ds.\end{aligned}$$

Recall that the mollifier $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$ leaves low Fourier modes unchanged, while eliminating high modes, with the cutoff at $1/\varepsilon$. Thus, all the low modes of $B_\varepsilon g$ and Bg cancel, leaving only large wavenumbers. At large wavenumbers, $\mathcal{F}(B_\varepsilon)(k) = 1$, since at those wavenumbers, we have $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon)(k) = 0$. We are now able to see that the limit as ε vanishes is zero:

$$\begin{aligned}(3.14)\quad \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0^+} \|(\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon - \mathcal{B})g\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq \lim_{N\to\infty} \sum_{|k|\geq N} \int_0^t \left|\mathcal{F}\left((B_\varepsilon(t-s)-B(t-s))g\right)(k)\right|^2 \; ds \\ &= \lim_{N\to\infty} \sum_{|k|\geq N} \int_0^t \left|\mathcal{F}[g - B(t-s)g](k)\right|^2 \; ds = 0.\end{aligned}$$

This is equal to zero because it is the limit of the tails of a convergent series. We have shown that $\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon$ converges to $\mathcal{B}$ in the strong operator topology. □

We next prove a result which will allow us to conclude $\mathcal{J}_\delta f_\varepsilon \to \mathcal{J}_\delta f$ in $L^2(0,t;L^2)$:

Lemma 3.5. *Let $t \in [0,T]$ and $\delta > 0$ be given. The sequence $\mathcal{J}_\delta f_\varepsilon$ converges to $\mathcal{J}_\delta f$ in $L^2(0,t;L^2)$.*

Proof. This is essentially the same argument using Plancherel and Tonelli that was used above in the proof of Lemma 3.4, but with much more adding and subtracting:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{J}_\delta\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon|^{2\sigma}\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x}) - \mathcal{J}_\delta(|u|^{2\sigma}u_x)\\
&= \underbrace{\mathcal{J}_\delta\Big[\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon|^{2\sigma}\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x}) - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon|^{2\sigma}\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_x)\Big]}_{A_1}\\
&+ \underbrace{\mathcal{J}_\delta\Big[\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon|^{2\sigma}\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_x) - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon|^{2\sigma}u_x)\Big]}_{A_2}\\
&+ \underbrace{\mathcal{J}_\delta\Big[\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon|^{2\sigma}u_x) - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u|^{2\sigma}u_x)\Big]}_{A_3}\\
&+ \underbrace{\mathcal{J}_\delta\Big[\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u|^{2\sigma}u_x) - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(|u|^{2\sigma}u_x)\Big]}_{A_4} + \underbrace{\mathcal{J}_\delta\Big[\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(|u|^{2\sigma}u_x) - |u|^{2\sigma}u_x\Big]}_{A_5}\\
&= A_1 + A_2 + A_3 + A_4 + A_5.
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.15}
$$

Of these, A_2, A_4 and A_5 go to zero as $\varepsilon \to 0$ by Lemma 2.1 since they involve differences between a mollified and an unmollified quantity. The other terms, A_1 and A_3, go to zero because u_ε converges to u. To demonstrate these convergences in detail, we will rely on the following results from Steps 2 and 3:

- The u_ε solutions are uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(0,T;H^1)$;
- $u \in L^\infty(0,T;H^1)$;
- $u_\varepsilon \to u$ in $L^2(0,T;H^{s'})$ for all $0 \le s' < 1$.

For A_1, we must take care, since we do not know that u_ε converges to u in $L^2(0,t;H^1)$. $\mathcal{J}_\delta$ was introduced just to deal with this difficulty. We first take the derivative away from $u_{\varepsilon,x} - u_x$, using the product rule:

$$
\begin{aligned}
A_1 = \mathcal{J}_\delta\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon\left(|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon|^{2\sigma}\partial_x(u_\varepsilon - u)\right) = &\underbrace{\mathcal{J}_\delta\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon\partial_x\Big(|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon|^{2\sigma}(u_\varepsilon - u)\Big)}_{A_{11}}\\
&\underbrace{-\mathcal{J}_\delta\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon\left((u_\varepsilon - u)\partial_x\left(|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon|^{2\sigma}\right)\right)}_{A_{12}}.
\end{aligned}
$$

For A_{11}, we use the fact that $\mathcal{J}_\delta\partial_x$ is a bounded operator, with the bound on the operator norm being clearly independent of ε. Then we have the following:

$$
\int_0^t \|A_{11}\|_{L^2}^2\, ds \le c\int_0^t\int_0^{2\pi} |\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon|^{4\sigma}|u_\varepsilon - u|^2\, dxds \le c\int_0^t\int_0^{2\pi} |u_\varepsilon - u|^2\, dxds,
$$

where we have used the uniform boundedness of the u_ε in $L^\infty(0,T;H^1)$. Since $u_\varepsilon \to u$ in $L^2(0,T;L^2)$, $A_{11} \to 0$ in $L^2(0,t;L^2)$.

For A_{12},

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^t \|A_{12}\|_{L^2}^2\,ds &\leq \int_0^t \|u_\varepsilon - u\|_{L^\infty}^2 \left\|\partial_x(|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon|^{2\sigma})\right\|_{L^2}^2 ds \\ &\leq \left\|\partial_x(|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon|^{2\sigma})\right\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^2 \int_0^t \|u_\varepsilon - u\|_{L^\infty}^2\,ds \\ &\leq c\int_0^t \|u_\varepsilon - u\|_{H^{3/4}}^2\,ds\end{aligned}$$

where we have again used the uniform boundedness of the u_ε in $L^\infty(0,T;H^1)$, as well as Sobolev embedding. Since $u_\varepsilon \to u$ in $L^2(0,T;H^{3/4})$, we have our result for A_{12}, and A_1 is done.

We treat A_3 similarly:

$$\int_0^t \|A_3\|_{L^2}^2\ ds \leq \int_0^t \int_0^{2\pi} |u_x|^2 \left||\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon|^{2\sigma} - |\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u|^{2\sigma}\right|^2 dxds.$$

Since $|z|^{2\sigma}$ is Lipschitz continuous, and using our uniform bounds, we can estimate this as

$$\int_0^t \|A_3\|_{L^2}^2\ ds \leq c\int_0^t \|u_\varepsilon - u\|_{L^\infty}^2\ ds \leq c\int_0^t \|u_\varepsilon - u\|_{H^{3/4}}^2\ ds$$

This vanishes for the same reason as above. Hence $A_3 \to 0$.

We will investigate A_5, but we will omit the details of the estimates for A_2 and A_4, as they are essentially the same as the estimate of A_5. We begin by writing the following:

$$\int_0^t \|A_5\|_{L^2}^2\ ds \leq \int_0^t \|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(|u|^{2\sigma}u_x) - |u|^{2\sigma}u_x\|_{L^2}^2\ ds. \tag{3.16}$$

Since $|u|^{2\sigma}u_x$ is an element of $L^2(0,T;L^2)$, we see from Lemma 2.1 that the right-hand side of (3.16) goes to zero as ε vanishes.

The same argument applies to show that A_2 and A_4 converge to zero. We have now established that $\mathcal{J}_\delta f_\varepsilon \to \mathcal{J}_\delta f$ in $L^2(0,t;L^2)$, for any $t \in [0,T]$. □

We have now shown that for each time $t \in [0,T]$, the following holds:

$$\mathcal{J}_\delta u_\varepsilon \to e^{i\partial_x^2 t}\mathcal{J}_\delta u_0 - \int_0^t e^{i\partial_x^2(s-t)}\mathcal{J}_\delta(|u|^{2\sigma}u_x)\ ds, \tag{3.17}$$

with the convergence being in L^2. Since u_ε converges to u at almost every time (along a subsequence), we conclude that

$$\mathcal{J}_\delta u = e^{i\partial_x^2 t}\mathcal{J}_\delta u_0 - \int_0^t e^{i\partial_x^2(s-t)}\mathcal{J}_\delta(|u|^{2\sigma}u_x)\ ds, \tag{3.18}$$

for almost every $t \in [0,T]$. We now must take the limit as δ vanishes.

Since $|u|^{2\sigma}u_x$ is in $L^2(0,T;L^2)$, by Lemma 2.1, we are able to take the limit in the integral in (3.18) as δ vanishes. By (2.4), we are able to take the limit in the other terms in (3.18) as δ vanishes. Thus, we find the following:

$$u = e^{i\partial_x^2 t}u_0 - \int_0^t e^{i\partial_x^2(t-s)}|u|^{2\sigma}u_x\ ds, \tag{3.19}$$

for almost all $t \in [0,T]$, with the above equality holding in the sense of L^2. We mention that for our $u \in L^\infty(0,T;H^1)$, the right-hand side of (3.19) makes sense for all $t \in [0,T]$, rather than just almost every t, and the value of this right-hand side would not change if we altered the definition of u on a set of times of measure zero. Therefore, we define u to be equal to the right-hand side of (3.19) for the times at which (3.19) did not already hold, which is indeed a set of measure zero. Thus, we may say that (3.19) is true for all $t \in [0,T]$, and furthermore, $\mathcal{J}_\delta u$ converges to u in L^2 for all $t \in [0,T]$.

We mention now that while we have shown $u \in L^\infty(0,T;H^1)$, it is actually the case that for all $t \in [0,T]$, we have $u(\cdot,t) \in H^1$. To see this, we begin by fixing $t \in [0,T]$. We have established just above that $\mathcal{J}_\delta u_\varepsilon(\cdot,t)$ converges in L^2 to $\mathcal{J}_\delta u(\cdot,t)$. We know, however, that $\mathcal{J}_\delta u_\varepsilon(\cdot,t)$ is bounded in H^1, uniformly in δ and ε; thus, there exists a subsequence which converges weakly in H^1 to some limit, as ε vanishes. This limit, however, must be $\mathcal{J}_\delta u(\cdot,t)$; thus, $\mathcal{J}_\delta u(\cdot,t)$ is not only in H^1, but satisfies the same bound (which is uniform with respect to δ). We have also shown just above that $\mathcal{J}_\delta u(\cdot,t)$ converges to $u(\cdot,t)$ in L^2. Again, since $\mathcal{J}_\delta u(\cdot,t)$ is uniformly bounded in H^1, it has a weak limit in H^1 along a subsequence. This limit must, however, be equal to $u(\cdot,t)$, and thus we see that $u(\cdot,t)$ is in H^1 for every $t \in [0,T]$. Furthermore, we have $u(\cdot,t)$ bounded in H^1, uniformly with respect to t.

We have almost established all of the claims of Theorem 1.1. All that remains is to demonstrate continuity in time, below the highest spatial regularity. This is the content of the following lemma.

Lemma 3.6. *Assume $u \in L^\infty(0,T;H^1)$ is a mild solution, then $u \in C(0,T;H^{s'})$ for all $0 \leq s' < 1$.*

Proof. Taking the difference, in L^2,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u(t+h)-u(t)\|_{L^2} &\leq \left\| \left(e^{i\partial_x^2(t+h)} - e^{i\partial_x^2 t} \right) u_0 \right\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad + \left\| \int_0^{t+h} e^{i\partial_x^2(t+h-s)} \left|u\right|^{2\sigma} u_x - \int_0^t e^{i\partial_x^2(t-s)} \left|u\right|^{2\sigma} u_x \right\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq \left\| e^{i\partial_x^2 h} - I \right\|_{L^2 \to L^2} \|u_0\|_{L^2} + \int_t^{t+h} \left\| \left|u\right|^{2\sigma} u_x \right\|_{L^2} ds \\
&\quad + \left\| e^{i\partial_x^2 h} - I \right\|_{L^2 \to L^2} \int_0^t \left\| \left|u\right|^{2\sigma} u_x \right\|_{L^2} ds \\
&\leq \left\| e^{i\partial_x^2 h} - I \right\|_{L^2 \to L^2} \left(\|u_0\|_{L^2} + T \|u\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^1}^{2\sigma+1} \right) \\
&\quad + h \|u\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^1}^{2\sigma+1}
\end{aligned}$$

By the continuity of the Schrödinger semigroup, the right-hand side vanishes as $h \to 0$, so $u \in C(0,T;L^2) \cap L^\infty(0,T;H^1)$. Using the ineterpolation estimate of Lemma 2.2, we actually obtain $u \in C(0,T;H^{s'}) \cap L^\infty(0,T;H^1)$ for all $0 \leq s' < 1$. □

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is complete. We are unable to conclude that the solutions we have constructed are continuous in time with values in H^1; at present, the most we can prove is that the solution is weakly continuous in time with values in H^1. We establish this and other additional properties of the H^1 solutions in the next subsection.

3.1. **Further properties of H^1 solutions.** The additional properties that we establish are motivated towards showing that small data is global in time in H^1. We are not able to prove this statement about global existence, but we will discuss in Section 5.2 below how much more is needed to close the gap.

While we have established above that the solution u is in H^1 at each time, we have only established that u is continuous in H^s for $s < 1$. We are not able to establish continuity in time in H^1; the best we can obtain is weak continuity in time, which is the content of the following lemma. We note that to establish continuity in time, given that we do establish weak continuity, it would only be necessary to prove that the H^1 norm of u is continuous in time. We note that in Section 4 below, for solutions with initial data in H^2, we are able to establish continuity of the highest norm, and thus continuity in H^2.

Theorem 3.7. *Let $k > 0$, and let $u \in L^\infty(0,T;H^k) \cap C(0,T;H^s)$, for all $s \in [0,k)$. Then u is weakly continuous in time with values in H^k.*

Proof. Let $t \in [0,T]$. We will establish the following convergence, for any $\phi \in H^k$:

$$\lim_{s\to t} \langle u(\cdot,s), \phi\rangle_{H^k} = \langle u(\cdot,t), \phi\rangle_{H^k}. \tag{3.20}$$

(The limit is of course taken to be a one-sided limit if either $t = 0$ or $t = T$.) We recall that the dual of H^k can be viewed either as being equal to H^k itself, or alternatively, as being equal to H^{-k}. Thus, given $\phi \in H^k$, if we define the bounded linear functional L_ϕ by

$$L_\phi(f) = \langle f, \phi\rangle_{H^k}, \qquad \forall f \in H^k,$$

then there exists $\tilde{\phi} \in H^{-k}$ such that for all $f \in H^k$, we have $L_\phi(f) = \langle f, \tilde{\phi}\rangle_{L^2}$. Therefore, in order to establish (4.3), it is sufficient to show that for all $\tilde{\phi} \in H^{-k}$, we have

$$\lim_{s\to t} \langle u(\cdot,s), \tilde{\phi}\rangle_{L^2} = \langle u(\cdot,t), \tilde{\phi}\rangle_{L^2}. \tag{3.21}$$

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given. Let $K > 0$ be such that for all $s \in [0,T]$, we have $\|u\|_{H^k} \le K$. Let $\psi \in H^{-k}$ be given. Since $H^{-k+1/2}$ is dense in H^{-k}, we can find $\psi_\epsilon \in H^{-k+1/2}$ such that $\|\psi_\epsilon - \psi\|_{H^{-k}} < \frac{\epsilon}{3K}$. Then, we add and subtract and use the triangle inequality as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle u(\cdot,s),\psi\rangle_{L^2} - \langle u(\cdot,t),\psi\rangle_{L^2}| &\le |\langle u(\cdot,s), \psi-\psi_\epsilon\rangle_{L^2}| \\ &\quad + |\langle u(\cdot,s)-u(\cdot,t),\psi_\epsilon\rangle_{L^2}| + |\langle u(\cdot,t),\psi_\epsilon-\psi\rangle_{L^2}|. \end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

For the first of these, we have

$$|\langle u(\cdot,s), \psi-\psi_\epsilon\rangle_{L^2}| \le \|u(\cdot,s)\|_{H^k}\|\psi-\psi_\epsilon\|_{H^{-k}} \le \frac{\epsilon}{3}.$$

Similarly, the third term on the right-hand side of (3.22) is also at most $\frac{\epsilon}{3}$. For the second term on the right-hand side of (3.22), we estimate it as

$$|\langle u(\cdot,s)-u(\cdot,t),\psi_\epsilon\rangle_{L^2}| \le \|u(\cdot,s)-u(\cdot,t)\|_{H^{k-1/2}}\|\psi_\epsilon\|_{H^{-k+1/2}}.$$

Since $u \in C([0,T];H^{k-1/2})$, there exists $\eta > 0$ such that if $|s-t| < \eta$, then

$$\|u(\cdot,s)-u(\cdot,t)\|_{H^{k-1/2}} \le \frac{\epsilon}{3(1+\|\psi_\epsilon\|_{H^{-k+1/2}})}.$$

We conclude that for all s such that $|s-t| < \eta$, we have

$$|\langle u(\cdot,s)-u(\cdot,t),\psi\rangle_{L^2}| < \epsilon.$$

This implies (3.21), and as we have argued, this implies (3.20). □

The other properties of our H^1 solutions which we note are related to the conserved quantities discussed in the introduction. It is helpful to note that the mollified equations also have the following conservation property, for which we omit the proof:

Lemma 3.8. *The mollified evolution conserves the mass and momentum invariants,* (1.5) *and* (1.6)*, as stated.*

We are able to conclude that the limit, u, also conserves mass and momentum. This is the content of the following lemma.

Lemma 3.9. *The solution that has been constructed, $u \in L^\infty(0,T;H^1)\cap C(0,T;H^{s'})$ with $0 \le s' < 1$, conserves the mass and momentum invariants,* (1.5) *and* (1.6)*.*

Proof. Recall that, up to subsequence extraction, $u_\varepsilon \to u$ in $L^2([0,T];L^2)$ and, for almost all t, $u_\varepsilon(\cdot,t) \rightharpoonup u(\cdot,t)$ in H^1. For the mass invariant,

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathcal{M}[u(t)] - \mathcal{M}[u_0]| \le{}& |\mathcal{M}[u(t)] - \mathcal{M}[u_\varepsilon(t)]| \\ &+ |\mathcal{M}[u_\varepsilon(t)] - \mathcal{M}[u_\varepsilon(0)]| + |\mathcal{M}[u_\varepsilon(0)] - \mathcal{M}[u_0]|\end{aligned}$$

Since the data is not regularized, the third term vanishes. The second term vanishes because the regularized flow conserves mass. Finally, the first term vanishes as $\varepsilon \to 0$ since we have convergence in L^2 for almost all t.

For the momentum invariant,

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathcal{P}[u(t)] - \mathcal{P}[u_0]| \le{}& |\mathcal{P}[u(t)] - \mathcal{P}[u_\varepsilon(t)]| \\ &+ |\mathcal{P}[u_\varepsilon(t)] - \mathcal{P}[u_\varepsilon(0)]| + |\mathcal{P}[u_\varepsilon(0)] - \mathcal{P}[u_0]|\,.\end{aligned}$$

As before, the second two terms vanish exactly. We are thus left to consider the first term,

$$\int \bar{u}u_x - \int \bar{u}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x} = \int \bar{u}(u_x - u_{\varepsilon,x}) + \int (\bar{u} - \bar{u}_\varepsilon)u_{\varepsilon,x}.$$

Since $u_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup u$ in H^1 for almost all t, the first integral vanishes as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Since we have convergence in L^2 for almost all t, and uniform boundedness of the u_ε sequence in H^1, the second integral also vanishes. □

We will see below in Section 5 that the Hamiltonian is conserved for smoother solutions than we are considering at present. For solutions in the energy space, the solutions we have constructed satisfy the following result:

Lemma 3.10. *For the constructed solution, $u \in L^\infty(0,T;H^1) \cap C(0,T;H^{s'})$ with $0 \le s' < 1$,*

$$\mathcal{H}[u(t)] \le \mathcal{H}[u_0]$$

Proof. We begin by splitting the Hamiltonian functional into kinetic and potential parts as $\mathcal{H}[u] = \mathcal{K}[u] + \mathcal{V}[u]$, with

$$\mathcal{K}[u] = \|u_x\|_{L^2}^2\,, \quad \mathcal{V}[u] = \frac{1}{(\sigma+1)^2}\int \bar{u}^{\sigma+1}D_x u^{\sigma+1}.$$

The regularized Hamlitonian is analogously split $\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon[u] = \mathcal{K}[u] + \mathcal{V}_\varepsilon[u]$:

$$\mathcal{K}[u] = \|u_x\|_{L^2}^2\,, \quad \mathcal{V}_\varepsilon[u] = \frac{1}{(\sigma+1)^2}\int (\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \bar{u})^{\sigma+1}D_x(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u)^{\sigma+1}.$$

We first show that for all $t \in [0,T]$,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \mathcal{V}_\varepsilon[u_\varepsilon(t)] = \mathcal{V}[u(t)]$$

Suppressing t and letting $v_\varepsilon \equiv \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon$, this follows by the direct calculation:

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{V}_\varepsilon[u_\varepsilon] - \mathcal{V}[u]| &\leq \frac{1}{(\sigma+1)^2}\int \left|(\bar{v}_\varepsilon^{\sigma+1} - \bar{u}^{\sigma+1})\partial_x v_\varepsilon^{\sigma+1}\right| \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{(\sigma+1)^2}\int \left|(v_\varepsilon^{\sigma+1} - u^{\sigma+1})\partial_x \bar{u}^{\sigma+1}\right| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\sigma+1}\left(\|u^\sigma u_x\|_{L^2} + \|v_\varepsilon^\sigma v_{\varepsilon,x}\|_{L^2}\right)\left\|v_\varepsilon^{\sigma+1} - u^{\sigma+1}\right\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq \left(\|u\|_{H^1}^{\sigma+1} + \|v_\varepsilon\|_{H^1}^{\sigma+1}\right)\max\{\|u\|_{L^\infty}, \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty}\}^\sigma \|v_\varepsilon - u\|_{L^2}
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\|v_\varepsilon\|_{H^1} \leq \|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^1}$, and u_ε are uniformly bounded in H^1 with respect to t and ε. Furthermore, the limit, u, is in $L^\infty_t H^1_x$. Thus, all that needs to be checked is that $\|v_\varepsilon - u\|_{L^2}$ vanishes as $\varepsilon \to 0$. This is immediate since $u_\varepsilon \to u$ in $L^2_t L^2_x$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon - u\|_{L^2} &\leq \|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon - u)\|_{L^2} + \|(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon - I)u\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq \|u_\varepsilon - u\|_{L^2} + \|(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon - I)u\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

To proceed, we remark that $\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon$ is continuous with respect to ε, so that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon[u_0] = \mathcal{H}[u_0].$$

Therefore, given u_0 and t, and $\delta > 0$, for all sufficiently small ε,

$$|\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon[u_0] - \mathcal{H}[u_0]| \leq \frac{\delta}{3}, \quad |\mathcal{V}_\varepsilon[u_\varepsilon(t)] - \mathcal{V}[u(t)]| \leq \frac{\delta}{3}.$$

Additionally, since $u_\varepsilon(t) \rightharpoonup u(t)$ in H^1 for almost all t,

$$\mathcal{K}[u(t)] = \|u_x(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0} \|u_{\varepsilon,x}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \mathcal{K}[u_\varepsilon(t)] + \frac{\delta}{3}$$

provided ε is sufficiently small. This implies the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}[u(t)] = \mathcal{K}[u(t)] + \mathcal{V}[u(t)] &\leq \mathcal{K}[u_\varepsilon(t)] + \mathcal{V}_\varepsilon[u_\varepsilon(t)] + \frac{2\delta}{3} \\
&\leq \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon[u_0] + \frac{2\delta}{3} \leq \mathcal{H}[u_0] + \delta.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\delta > 0$ was arbitrary, we are done.

□

4. Well-posedness in H^2

If we are willing to work with solutions in H^2, stronger results can be obtained. Specifically, in this section, we prove Theorem 1.2.

Step 1: Short-time existence.

Assume now that $u_0 \in H^2$. Using the same mollified equation, (3.1), we can immediately obtain local in time solutions for all $\varepsilon > 0$, in $C^1(-T_\varepsilon, T_\varepsilon, H^2)$. The only difference is that in obtaining the Lipschitz continuity of the right-hand side, we use (2.3) with $s = 2$:

$$\|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon F_\varepsilon(f) - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon F_\varepsilon(g)\|_{H^2} \leq \frac{c}{\epsilon^2}\|F_\varepsilon(f) - F_\varepsilon(g)\|_{L^2}$$

Step 2: Existence on a uniform time interval. For solutions in H^2, it is sufficient to work with $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^2}^2$ as the energy. Indeed,

Lemma 4.1. *For the solutions $u_\varepsilon \in C^1(-T_\varepsilon, T_\varepsilon, H^2)$,*

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^2}^2 \leq (6\sigma + 8\sigma^2)\|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^2}^{4\sigma+4} \tag{4.1}$$

Proof. This can be obtained by a direct calculation. Note that the time derivative of $\int |u_\varepsilon|^2$ vanishes because it is conserved.

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}\|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^2}^2 &= \int -\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \bar{u}_{\varepsilon,xxxx} \left|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon\right|^{2\sigma} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x} + \text{c.c.} \\
&= \int \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \bar{u}_{\varepsilon,xxx} \left(\left|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon\right|^{2\sigma} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x}\right)_x + \text{c.c.} \\
&= \int \left(\left|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,xx}\right|^2\right)_x \left|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon\right|^{2\sigma} \\
&\quad + \int \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \bar{u}_{\varepsilon,xxx} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x} \left(\left|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon\right|^{2\sigma}\right)_x + \text{c.c.} \\
&= -3 \underbrace{\int \left|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,xx}\right|^2 \left(\left|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon\right|^{2\sigma}\right)_x}_{I_1} - \underbrace{\int \left(\left|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x}\right|^2\right)_x \left(\left|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon\right|^{2\sigma}\right)_{xx}}_{I_2}
\end{aligned}$$

For the first term,

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &= \int \left|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,xx}\right|^2 \left(\sigma \left|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon\right|^{2\sigma-2} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \bar{u_\varepsilon} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x} + \text{c.c.}\right) \\
&\leq 2\sigma \left\|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon\right\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma-1} \left\|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x}\right\|_{L^\infty} \left\|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,xx}\right\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\leq 2\sigma \left\|u_\varepsilon\right\|_{H^1}^{2\sigma-1} \left\|u_\varepsilon\right\|_{H^2}^3 \leq 2\sigma \left\|u_\varepsilon\right\|_{H^2}^{2\sigma+2}
\end{aligned}$$

For the other term,

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &= \int \left(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \bar{u}_{\varepsilon,x} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,xx} + \text{c.c.}\right) \left(\sigma \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \bar{u_\varepsilon}^\sigma \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon^{\sigma-1} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x} + \text{c.c.}\right)_x \\
&= \int \left(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \bar{u}_{\varepsilon,x} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,xx} + \text{c.c.}\right) \\
&\qquad \times \left(\sigma^2 \left|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \bar{u_\varepsilon}\right|^{2\sigma-2} \left|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x}\right|^2 + \sigma(\sigma-1) \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \bar{u_\varepsilon}^\sigma \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon^{\sigma-2} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x}^2 + \sigma \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \bar{u_\varepsilon}^\sigma \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon^{\sigma-1} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,xx} + \text{c.c.}\right) \\
&\leq 4\sigma^2 \left\|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon\right\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma-2} \left\|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x}\right\|_{L^\infty}^2 \left\|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x}\right\|_{L^2} \left\|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,xx}\right\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad + 4\sigma(\sigma-1) \left\|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon\right\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma-2} \left\|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x}\right\|_{L^\infty}^2 \left\|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x}\right\|_{L^2} \left\|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,xx}\right\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad + 4\sigma \left\|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \bar{u_\varepsilon}\right\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma-1} \left\|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,x}\right\|_{L^\infty} \left\|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon,xx}\right\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\leq (8\sigma^2 - 4\sigma) \left\|u_\varepsilon\right\|_{H^1}^{2\sigma-1} \left\|u_\varepsilon\right\|_{H^2}^3 + 4\sigma \left\|u_\varepsilon\right\|_{H^1}^{2\sigma-1} \left\|u_\varepsilon\right\|_{H^2}^3 \\
&\leq 8\sigma^2 \left\|u_\varepsilon\right\|_{H^2}^{2\sigma+2}
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^2}^2 \leq \left(6\sigma + 8\sigma^2\right) \left\|u_\varepsilon\right\|_{H^2}^{2\sigma+2}.$$

□

We are now assured that these solutions cannot blow up arbitrarily fast so there exists a T, independent of ε, for which the solutions must exist.

Step 3: Passage to the Limit

As before, we are able to pass the the limit by using the Aubin-Lions Lemma. We find u_ε converges (along a subsequence) to $u \in L^2(0,T;L^2)$. In the same way as before, we are able to further conclude that $u \in L^\infty(0,T;H^2)$, and u_ε converges to u in $L^2(0,T;H^{s'})$, for any $s' \in [0,2)$. Following the same arguments as before, we are able to conclude that u is a mild solution of (1.1), i.e., u satisfies (3.19). Lemma 3.6 also generalizes, allowing us to infer $u \in C(0,T;H^s)$ for all $0 \leq s < 2$. In fact, we will show below that the solution is actually continuous in time in H^2.

In the present setting, we can obtain differentiability in time:

Lemma 4.2. *Assume $u \in L^\infty(0,T;H^2) \cap C(0,T;H^1)$ is a mild solution. Then $u_t \in L^\infty(0,T;L^2)$ and $u_t = iu_{xx} - |u|^{2\sigma} u_x$.*

Proof. We begin by writing

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| h^{-1}\left(u(t+h)-u(t)\right) - \left(|u|^{2\sigma}u - iu_{xx}\right)\right\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq \left\| h^{-1}\left(e^{ih\partial_x^2} - I - ih\partial_x^2\right)u(t)\right\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad + \left\| h^{-1}\int_t^{t+h} e^{i\partial_x^2(t+h-s)}\,|u|^{2\sigma}u_x ds - |u|^{2\sigma}u_x\right\|_{L^2}
\end{aligned}$$

Since $s \mapsto (|u|^{2\sigma}u_x)(s)$ is a continuous mapping into L^2, so is $s \mapsto e^{i\partial_x^2(t+h-s)}(|u|^{2\sigma}u_x)(s)$. Therefore, by the mean value theorem for integrals,

$$h^{-1}\int_t^{t+h} e^{i\partial_x^2(t+h-s)}\,|u|^{2\sigma}u_x ds = e^{i\partial_x^2(t+h-\tilde{t})}(|u|^{2\sigma}u_x)(\tilde{t})$$

for some $t \leq \tilde{t} \leq t+h$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| h^{-1}\left(u(t+h)-u(t)\right) - \left(|u|^{2\sigma}u - iu_{xx}\right)\right\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq \left\| h^{-1}\left(e^{ih\partial_x^2} - I - ih\partial_x^2\right)u(t)\right\|_{L^2} + \left\| e^{i\partial_x^2(t+h-\tilde{t})}(|u|^{2\sigma}u_x)(\tilde{t}) - (|u|^{2\sigma}u_x)(t)\right\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

By the continuity of u and the properties of the Schrödinger semigroup, this vanishes as $h \to 0$. Thus, u_t exists and $u_t = iu_{xx} - |u|^{2\sigma}u_x$. Again, because of the regularity of u, $u_t \in L^\infty(0,T;L^2)$. □

We note that when we prove below that $u \in C(0,T;H^2)$, this will demonstrate that in fact $u_t \in C(0,T;L^2)$.

Lemma 4.3. *If $u \in L^\infty(0,T;H^2) \cap C(0,T;H^1)$ is mild solution, it is unique.*

Proof. This follows a Gronwall inequality, and Lemma 4.2 which says u solves (1.1) in the strong sense. Indeed, if u and v are two solutions, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}\|u-v\|_{L^2}^2 &= \int (\bar{u}-\bar{v})(u_t - v_t) + \text{c.c.} \\
&= \int (\bar{u}-\bar{v})(-iu_{xx} + iv_{xx}) + \text{c.c.} \\
&\quad + \int (\bar{u}-\bar{v})(|u|^{2\sigma}u_x - |v|^{2\sigma}v_x) + \text{c.c.}
\end{aligned}$$

The first integral vanishes after integrating by parts and adding the complex conjugate. The second integral will be bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int (\bar{u}-\bar{v})(|u|^{2\sigma}u_x - |v|^{2\sigma}v_x) + \text{c.c.} \\
&= \int (\bar{u}-\bar{v})(|u|^{2\sigma} - |v|^{2\sigma})u_x + \text{c.c.} + \int (\bar{u}-\bar{v})\,|v|^{2\sigma}(u_x - v_x) + \text{c.c.} \\
&\leq \int 4\sigma \max\{|u|,|v|\}^{2\sigma-1}\,|u-v|\,|u_x| + \int 2\sigma\,|v|^{2\sigma-1}\,|v_x|\,|u-v|^2 \\
&\leq C(\|u\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^2}, \|v\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^2})\,\|u-v\|_{L^2}^2
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Gronwall

$$\|(u-v)(\cdot,t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|(u-v)(\cdot,0)\|_{L^2}^2\, e^{Ct}.$$

If the solutions agree at $t=0$, they agree for all time. □

Corollary 4.4. *If $u, v \in L^\infty(0,T;H^2) \cap C(0,T;H^1)$ are two mild solutions, then*

$$\|(u-v)(\cdot,t)\|_{H^{s'}} \leq Ke^{Ct}\,\|(u-v)(\cdot,0)\|_{L^2}^{1-s'/2}$$

for any $0 \leq s' < 2$.

Proof. Following the same scheme as in Lemma 4.3, we immediately obtain

$$\|(u-v)(\cdot,t)\|_{L^2} \leq e^{Ct}\,\|(u-v)(\cdot,0)\|_{L^2}.$$

Using the interpolation estimate, Lemma 2.2,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(u-v)(\cdot,t)\|_{H^{s'}} &\leq c\,\|(u-v)(\cdot,t)\|_{H^2}^{s'/2}\,\|(u-v)(\cdot,t)\|_{L^2}^{1-s'/2} \\
&\leq c\left(\|u\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^2} + \|v\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^2}\right)^{s'/2} e^{C(1-s'/2)t}\,\|(u-v)(\cdot,0)\|_{L^2}^{1-s'/2}
\end{aligned}$$

□

Having proved existence, uniqueness, and continuous dependence of solutions, we will conclude this section with a little more on the regularity of the H^2 solutions. In particular, we will now prove that the solutions are in $C([0,T];H^2)$; proving this will complete the proof of Theorem 1.2. We are attempting to show that for any $t \in [0,T]$,

$$\lim_{s\to t} \|u(\cdot,s) - u(\cdot,t)\|_{H^2}^2 = 0,$$

and the limit is understood to be one sided at $t=0$ and $t=T$. We can rewrite this as

$$\lim_{s\to t} \|u(\cdot,s)\|_{H^2}^2 - 2\lim_{s\to t}\langle u(\cdot,s), u(\cdot,t)\rangle_{H^2} = -\|u(\cdot,t)\|_{H^2}^2.$$

This will follow from the following two items:

$$\lim_{s\to t} \|u(\cdot,s)\|_{H^2}^2 = \|u(\cdot,t)\|_{H^2}^2, \tag{4.2}$$

$$\lim_{s\to t}\langle u(\cdot,s), u(\cdot,t)\rangle_{H^2} = \|u(\cdot,t)\|_{H^2}^2. \tag{4.3}$$

Of these, (4.3) follows from Theorem 3.7 with $k=2$.

To establish (4.2), we begin by proving that the norm is right-continuous at $t=0$:

$$\lim_{t\to 0^+} \|u(\cdot,t)\|_{H^2}^2 = \|u_0\|_{H^2}^2.$$

Note that we have already shown that for all $\tau \in [0,T)$, $u(\cdot,t) \overset{H^2}{\rightharpoonup} u(\cdot,\tau)$ as $t \to \tau^+$. This implies

$$\|u(\cdot,\tau)\|_{H^2}^2 \leq \liminf_{t\to\tau^+} \|u(\cdot,t)\|_{H^2}^2, \qquad \forall \tau \in [0,T). \tag{4.4}$$

Evaluating (4.4) at $\tau = 0$,

$$\|u_0\|_{H^2}^2 \leq \liminf_{t\to 0^+} \|u(\cdot,t)\|_{H^2}^2.$$

To complete the argument, we will use the energy inequality to show that

$$\limsup_{t\to 0^+} \|u(\cdot,t)\|_{H^2}^2 \leq \|u_0\|_{H^2}^2. \tag{4.5}$$

The energy inequality, established above, is

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^2}^2 \leq c(\|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^2}^2)^{\sigma+1}.$$

As above, we let K be an upper bound for $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^2}^2$, for all $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$, on the time interval $[0,T]$. Then, the energy inequality becomes

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^2}^2 \leq cK^{\sigma+1}.$$

Integrating this with respect to time, we get

$$\|u_\varepsilon(\cdot,t)\|_{H^2}^2 - \|u_0\|_{H^2}^2 \leq cK^{\sigma+1}t.$$

As we have established $u_\varepsilon \overset{H^2}{\rightharpoonup} u$ for almost every time, we get

$$\|u(\cdot,t)\|_{H^2}^2 - \|u_0\|_{H^2}^2 \leq cK^{\sigma+1}t, \qquad \text{a.e. } t \in [0,T). \tag{4.6}$$

So (4.6) may not hold for values of t in a set of measure zero. Now, let $\tau \in [0,T)$. We use (4.4); since a set of measure zero contains no interval, there must be a sequence of times approaching τ from above for which we can use the inequality of (4.6). This implies

$$\|u(\cdot,\tau)\|_{H^2}^2 \leq \liminf_{t\to\tau^+} \left\{\|u_0\|_{H^2}^2 + cK^{\sigma+1}t\right\} = \|u_0\|_{H^2}^2 + cK^{\sigma+1}\tau.$$

We see then that the inequality of (4.6) actually holds for all $t \in [0,T)$. Taking the limit superior as $t \to 0^+$ of both sides of the inequality of (4.6), we conclude that (4.5) holds.

This argument can then be repeated to demonstrate right-continuity of the norm at any $t \in (0,T)$. This implies right-continuity of the norm on $[0,T)$; we then need to establish left-continuity of the norm on $(0,T]$. This, however, is actually the same argument, if we reverse time. We now briefly discuss left-continuity at $t = T$, but left-continuity at times in $(0,T)$ is similar. Let s be a time-like variable, and consider the initial value problem

$$-iv_s + i|v|^{2\sigma}v_x + v_{xx} = 0, \qquad v(\cdot,0) = u(T).$$

The same estimates can be made for v as we have made for u, to find existence of a solution v on some time interval. We can then repeat the above argument to show that the norm of this solution is right-continuous at $s = 0$. By uniqueness of solutions, though, we must have $v(\cdot,s) = u(\cdot,T-s)$. This implies that the norm of u is left-continuous at $t = T$. This complete the proof of Theorem 1.2.

As a final note on our H^2 solutions, we remark that they conserve the Hamiltonian.

Lemma 4.5. *If $u \in C(0,T;H^2) \cap C(0,T;H^1)$ is mild solution, it conserves the Hamiltonian,* (1.4).

Proof. This follows by direct calculation, using Lemma 4.2, which shows that the equality in (1.1) holds in the sense of L^2 for almost all t. □

5. Discussion

We have demonstrated the existence of local-in-time mild solutions in H^1, along with local in time existence and uniqueness in H^2. Taking the initial data in H^2 also allows us to obtain continuous dependence on the data, and continuity in time of solutions in H^2. We were, unfortunately, unable to show that the H^1 solutions belonged to $C(0,T;H^1)$. Our H^2 solutions are a step towards the justifying the time dependent simulations appearing in [16, 17].

5.1. **Remarks on Our Construction.** An interesting feature of our H^1 result is the use of the Hamiltonian in the construction of the energy functional, (3.6). Indeed, the H^1 norm is inadequate for the energy method as $\frac{d}{dt}\|u_x\|_{L^2}^2$, after integration by parts, is cubic in u_x, and thus cannot be bounded in terms of the H^1 norm. We are able to deal with this by using the conservation of the Hamiltonian. While control of the Hamiltonian itself does not give control of a norm, we are able to add lower-order terms to it to be able to control the H^1 norm, and we are able to estimate the growth of these lower-order terms.

We are not able to prove uniqueness of the H^1 solutions we construct. We are aware of two main approaches to proving uniqueness of solutions. Uniqueness can come from the process of construction of solutions, if the method used is, for instance, to prove existence of a fixed point via the contraction mapping principle. Otherwise, we can make an estimate for the difference of two solutions (this is what we did for our H^2 uniqueness theorem). This estimate, however, requires the equation (1.1) to be satisfied in a strong sense. Since our H^1 solutions are only mild solutions, this approach is also not accessible to us; we were able to use it for our H^2 solutions because of Lemma 4.2.

5.2. **Implications of Greater Regularity in Time.** Were our H^1 solutions continuous in time into H^1, two further things could be accomplished. First, it is a prerequisite for the notion of weak solution applied in [5, 6]; a weak notion of differentiability, (1.3), is also required. Thus, the existence framework needed to fully justify the results of [17] remains unresolved.

Second, if we did have continuity in time into H^1, we would be able to conclude global-in-time existence for solutions with sufficiently small data. In this case, an *a priori* bound could be constructed using the mass and Hamiltonian. To demonstrate this, we begin with the following estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}+\mathcal{H} &\geq \|u\|_{H^1}^2 - \frac{1}{\sigma+1}\int |u|^{2\sigma+1}\,|u_x| \\ &\geq \|u\|_{H^1}^2 - \frac{1}{\sigma+1}\,\|u\|_{L^{4\sigma+2}}^{2\sigma+1}\,\|u_x\|_{L^2} \\ &\geq \|u\|_{H^1}^2 - c_\sigma\,\|u\|_{H^1}^{2\sigma+2} \equiv f_\sigma\left(\|u\|_{H^1}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

where c_σ is a constant that depends only on σ. For $\sigma > 0$, f_σ has a local minimum at 0 and a local maximum at some $x_\star > 0$.

To proceed, we assume that there exist mild solutions of the equation such that:

- The mapping $t \mapsto \|u(t)\|_{H^1}$ is continuous;
- The solution conserves the invariants for the lifetime of the solution.

We call the above assumptions **(A1)** and **(A2)**, respectively. Under these assumptions, the flow admits the following dichotomy:

Lemma 5.1. *For $\sigma \geq 1$, such a flow admits the dichotomy that if $\mathcal{H}+\mathcal{M} < f_\sigma(x_\star)$, then:*

- *If $\|u_0\|_{H^1} < x_\star$, then $\|u_0\|_{H^1} < x_\star$ for the lifetime of the solution.*
- *If $\|u_0\|_{H^1} > x_\star$, then $\|u_0\|_{H^1} > x_\star$ for the lifetime of the solution.*

Proof. By the assumption and (5.1), for the lifetime of the solution,

$$f_\sigma(\|u(t)\|_{H^1}) \leq \mathcal{H} + \mathcal{M} < f_\sigma(x_\star) \tag{5.2}$$

Now, assume $\|u_0\|_{H^1} < x_\star$ and let

$$\tau \equiv \inf\left\{t \leq T \mid \|u(t)\|_{H^1} \geq x_\star\right\},$$

taking $\tau = +\infty$ if the set is empty. If $\tau < \infty$, then by the continuity of $\|u(t)\|_{H^1}$, there exists $0 < t_1 < \tau \leq T$ at which $\|u(t_1)\|_{H^1} = x_\star$. But this violates (5.2), so $\|u(t)\|_{H^1} < x_\star$ for the lifetime of the solution. We have the analogous result if $\|u_0\|_{H^1} > x_\star$. □

Consequently,

Theorem 5.2. *Assume* **(A1)** *and* **(A2)**, *and assume $\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{M} < f_\sigma(x_\star)$ and $\|u_0\|_{H^1} < x_\star$. Furthermore, assume that there is a lower bound for the time of existence of solutions, uniform in the H^1 size of the data. Then the solution exists for all time.*

We note that in the paper [21], Tsutsumi and Fukuda were able to conclude existence of global small solutions, but, as noted in our introduction, their approach requires sufficiently smooth nonlinearities.

The above results apply to our H^2 solutions in the following way. Since our mild H^2 solutions are in $C(0,T;H^1)$ and conserve the invariants, Lemma 5.1 applies. Hence, with data in H^2 that is sufficiently small in H^1, solutions remain uniformly bounded in H^1 for the lifetime of the solution. Moreover, since our estimate of the time of existence depends on the H^2 size of the data, we can infer that if the solution ceases to be global, it is because $\|u_{xx}\|_{L^2}$ is blowing up: there exists a finite $T_{\text{blowup}} > 0$ such that

$$\limsup_{t \to T^-_{\text{blowup}}} \|u_{xx}(t)\|_{L^2} = \infty. \tag{5.3}$$

It is our conjecture that no such blowup occurs, and that with a refined analysis using the dispersive properties of the Schrödinger semigroup, sufficiently small data in H^2 will yield solutions which are global in time.

References

[1] D. Ambrose. Well-posedness of vortex sheets with surface tension. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 35(1):211–244, 2003.

[2] J. Colliander, M. Keel, G. Staffilani, H. Takaoka, and T. Tao. Global well-posedness for Schrödinger equations with derivative. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 33(3):649–669, 2001.

[3] J. Colliander, M. Keel, G. Staffilani, H. Takaoka, and T. Tao. A refined global well-posedness result for Schrödinger equations with derivative. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 34(1):64–86, 2002.

[4] P. Constantin and C. Foias. *Navier-Stokes equations*. Chicago Lectures in Mathematics. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 1988.

[5] M. Grillakis, J. Shatah, and W. Strauss. Stability theory of solitary waves in the presence of symmetry. I. *Journal Of Functional Analysis*, 74(1):160–197, 1987.

[6] M. Grillakis, J. Shatah, and W. Strauss. Stability theory of solitary waves in the presence of symmetry. II. *Journal Of Functional Analysis*, 94(2):308–348, 1990.

[7] A. Grünrock and S. Herr. Low Regularity Local Well-Posedness of the Derivative Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation with Periodic Initial Data. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 39(6):1890–1920, 2008.

[8] C. Hao. Well-posedness for one-dimensional derivative nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *Communications on Pure and Applied Analysis*, 6(4):997–1021, 2007.

[9] N. Hayashi. The initial value problem for the derivative nonlinear Schrödinger equation in the energy space. *Nonlinear Analysis. Theory, Methods & Applications. An International Multidisciplinary Journal. Series A: Theory and Methods*, 20(7):823–833, 1993.

[10] N. Hayashi and T. Ozawa. On the derivative nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 55(1-2):14–36, 1992.

[11] N. Hayashi and T. Ozawa. Finite energy solutions of nonlinear Schrödinger equations of derivative type. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 25(6):1488–1503, 1994.

[12] N. Hayashi and T. Ozawa. Remarks on nonlinear Schrödinger equations in one space dimension. *Differential and Integral Equations. An International Journal for Theory and Applications*, 7(2):453–461, 1994.

[13] S. Herr. On the Cauchy problem for the derivative nonlinear Schrödinger equation with periodic boundary condition. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, pages Art. ID 96763–33, 2006.

[14] C. E. Kenig, G. Ponce, and L. Vega. Small solutions to nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré. Analyse Non Linéaire*, 10(3):255–288, 1993.

[15] C. E. Kenig, G. Ponce, and L. Vega. Smoothing effects and local existence theory for the generalized nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *Inventiones Mathematicae*, 134(3):489–545, 1998.

[16] X. Liu, G. Simpson, and C. Sulem. Focusing singularity in a derivative nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 262:48–58, Nov. 2013.

[17] X. Liu, G. Simpson, and C. Sulem. Stability of Solitary Waves for a Generalized Derivative Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation. *Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 23(4):557–583, Jan. 2013.

[18] J. Moses, B. Malomed, and F. Wise. Self-steepening of ultrashort optical pulses without self-phase-modulation. *Physical Review A - Atomic, Molecular, and Optical Physics*, 76(2), 2007.

[19] T. Ozawa. On the nonlinear Schrödinger equations of derivative type. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal*, 45(1):137–163, 1996.

[20] C. Sulem and P.-L. Sulem. *The Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation: Self-Focusing and Wave Collapse*. Springer, 1999.

[21] M. Tsutsumi and I. Fukuda. On solutions of the derivative nonlinear Schrödinger equation. Existence and uniqueness theorem. *Fako de l'Funkcialaj Ekvacioj Japana Matematika Societo. Funkcialaj Ekvaciog. Serio Internacia*, 23(3):259–277, 1980.

Department of Mathematics, Drexel University, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA

Department of Mathematics, Drexel University, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA